

SECTION VI

MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS AND QUALITY OF PROPOSAL

VI. (320 points) Miscellaneous Benefits and Quality of Proposal

A. Size of request, other contributions, number of persons benefiting, cost of grant per benefited person (40)

Estimated Total Project Cost	<u>\$ 5,206,000</u>
Amount of FPCP Grant Funds Requested	<u>\$ 4,994,000</u>
Amount of Local Funds Contributed	<u>\$ 106,000</u>
Amount of In-kind Contributions	<u>\$ 106,000</u>
Additional Funding Sources	

Number of persons expected to benefit 2,589

Flood Protection Corridor Funds per person benefited.* \$ 1,929

(* Count as beneficiaries those receiving flood benefits, recreational users of habitat areas protected by the Project, and consumers of food products from agricultural areas conserved by the Project.)

The Project cost estimate, in support of the above numbers, is found in Appendix #5.

B. Quality of effects on water supply or water quality (90)

1. Will water stored by the project provide for any conjunctive use, groundwater recharge, or water supply benefit?

To the extent that residents are relocated and improvements removed from the floodplain, the Project will allow water to spread out over a greater area of the floodplain, which will result in additional recharge to the underlying aquifer. In addition, consumptive use of groundwater would be reduced which would enhance groundwater storage.

2. Does the project fence cattle out?

No.

3. Does the project pass water over newly developed fresh water marsh?

No. However, as groundwater levels rise through additional recharge and reduced consumptive use, riparian vegetation may develop in the future.

4. Does the project trap sediments?

The Project will result in decreased sediment transport capabilities through the subdivision by allowing flows to slow down and spread out, as described in Section IV-B and -C.

C. Quality of impact on underrepresented populations or historic or cultural resources (60)

1. Does the project benefit underrepresented populations? Explain.

Yes. According to the most recent Kern Council of Governments census information, 104 of the dwellings are occupied, mostly by the owners; the total population is 229 persons in the flood zone; the median age is 50, with 52 of the households with persons over 60 years old; and the median income is reported to be \$19,265. The residents have a hard time paying a relatively nominal assessment for ongoing maintenance of a levee which provides inadequate protection, let alone paying for improvements.

2. Are historical or cultural resources impacted by the project? Explain.

A search of historical and cultural resources in the area shows that there are none impacted by the Project. The search was conducted by the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center at California State University, Bakersfield. The report is attached to the Environmental Checklist/Initial Study Form in Appendix #7.

D. Technical and fiscal capability of the project team (60)

1. Does the project require scientific or technical expertise, and if so, is it provided for in the grant proposal?

The Project requires the use of Engineers, Lawyers, Appraisers, and Biologists. Those assisting in the preparation of the Grant Application will be involved in the grant administration, and costs are included in the proposal.

2. Grant funds will be available in phases. What monitoring and reporting mechanisms are built into your administrative plan to track progress, initiation, and completion of successive phases?

The Project will entail several phases; appraisals, surveys, acquisition and removal of improvements, land reclamation and restoration, floodproofing, and eventual removal of the levee system. Each phase will be documented in semi-annual reports prepared for the KCWA Board of Directors and quarterly for the ID 3 Advisory Committee. The semi-annual reports will be submitted to DWR for review. Each phase will be deemed complete when the identified acquisition and easement goals have been reached.

3. Please outline your team's management, fiscal and technical capability to effectively carry out your proposal. Mention any previous or ongoing grant management experience you have.

The Project team will be headed by Rick Iger, Engineering and Operations Manager with the Kern County Water Agency. Mr. Iger has been a licensed Civil Engineer in the State of California for eighteen years. He has administered construction projects funded under Propositions 44 and 204, as well as the Year 2000 funding cycle under Proposition 13 for Recharge and Infrastructure Improvements. These projects had values ranging from \$ 3 million to \$ 23 million. The team assisting Mr. Iger includes consultants with expertise in Water Resources Engineering, Wildlife Biology, Real Estate Appraisals, and Legal Counsel. Resumes are included in Appendix #6.

E. Coordination and cooperation with other projects, partner agencies, and affected organizations and individuals (80)

1. List cost sharing and in-kind partners and any other stakeholders involved with your project and indicate the nature of their contribution, if any. Address the team's ability to leverage outside funds.

Cost Sharing and In-Kind Services Partners include the Kern County Water Agency through their General Fund, as well as their Improvement District No. 3 Fund. As much as \$ 212,000 will be provided in this manner. Other stakeholders include the property owners within the Project area, some of whom have already begun floodproofing their homes. Land management alternatives have also been discussed with BLM, Fish and Game, and Audubon's Kern River Preserve Manager.

2. Does your project overlap with or complement ongoing activities being carried out by others (such as CALFED, the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, the Delta levee program, local floodplain management programs, the Reclamation Board's Designated Floodway program, or a multiple objective regional or

watershed plan)? If so, indicate any coordination that has taken place to date or is scheduled to take place in the future.

The Project is adjacent to the BLM Kiavah Wilderness Area, and between Audubon's Kern River Preserve, a Globally Important Bird Area, and Butterbrecht Canyon, a Nationally Important Bird Area. In addition, the US Army Corps of Engineers is in the process of acquiring additional bird habitat in the South Fork area of the Kern River, some of which may be adjacent to the Project area. Discussions have been initiated with BLM and Audubon Kern River Preserve.

3. Will this application, if approved, begin the next phase of a previously approved project or advance an ongoing project substantially toward completion?

The Grant will provide funds to continue an ongoing program of acquiring properties within the Kelso Creek Floodplain to help decrease flow depths and velocities, and otherwise reduce flood damages. This program began in 1998 in advance of the predicted "El Nino" wet year. However, local funding has proven insufficient to complete the program.

4. Describe how the proposal demonstrates a coordinated approach among affected landowners, local governments, and nonprofit organizations. If other entities are affected, is there written support for the proposal and a willingness to cooperate?

Public meetings have been held on January 3, 2003 and January 31, 2003, to determine if the landowners would be in support of such a Project. Questionnaires were provided to the landowners at the meeting and by mail. Results of these public outreach

effortswere tabulated and included in the Application. The majority of the landowners were interested in the Project and recommended proceeding with the Grant application. In addition, discussions have been initiated with BLM, Department of Fish and Game, and Audubon Kern River Preserve.